



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/842,082

04/26/2001

Jae Kyung Lee

P-222

6941

34610 7590 05/29/2008

KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER

RAMAN, USHA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/29/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/842,082 | Applicant(s) LEE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner USHA RAMAN | Art Unit 2623 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11,13-30 and 40-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-11,13-30 and 40-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 21st, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10, 27, and 42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3-6, 8-11, 13-14, 17-19, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (US PG Pub. 2004/0024657) in view of Hayashi (JP 06217222 A).

With respect to claim 1, Wright discloses a system comprising a storing unit (200) for storing proper information of the product and the contact information of a certain site (see [0020], [0025]), the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV (see [0023]);

Controlling unit (202) for contacting the certain site and for transmitting proper information from the product to the certain site (see [0030], [0036]), and the controlling unit controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information (404) and error check up menu (410, 406) of the product received from the Internet based on the proper information of the product and the contact information (see [0036]-[0037] and [0039]), the storing unit storing proper information of the product prior to the controlling unit contacting the certain site (see [0020], [0025]).

Wright fails to disclose that the “product” is a TV and further lacks the step of transmitting a proper information of the product when a checkup key signal is input by the user.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hayashi discloses storing proper information that is typically found on a label of a television in the storing unit at a time of manufacture (see [0015]), wherein this proper information read out of memory when the user enters service mode (see [0013]) for troubleshooting or maintenance (see [0001]). Hayashi further discloses that user enters such a service mode by a predetermined key operation (see [0016]). Hayashi therefore teaches the step of a product that is a television, storing label information in the storage unit of the television, and using an check up key signal for product maintenance information, wherein the label information is read out from memory when user inputs the check up key signal.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Wright in a television system such as Hayashi, thereby providing user updated, relevant information in a “service mode” related to user’s specific product when a check up key is input.

With regards to claim 3, Wright discloses that the certain site is a service related site providing information corresponding to the function information (402) and the error check up menu of the TV (406,410). (see [0031]-[0036]).

With regards to claim 4, Wright discloses that the information corresponding to function information and error check up menu of the TV is received from the service related site server (see [0045]).

With regards to claim 5, the modified system as discussed in claim 1 above comprises the method of transmitting proper information of the TV to the service related site server.

With regards to claim 6, the proper information of the TV is contacted to the service-related site server through a network interface (204).

With regards to claim 8, the contact information is a URL of the certain site (see [0020]).

With regards to claim 9, the modified system comprises a television product, wherein the function information corresponds to the product support manuals (see [0034]). Since television reproduces audio and video signals, it would be obvious to include video or audio related functions in the product specifications for adjusting audio/video related functions.

With regards to claim 10, Wright discloses a method for contacting a certain service related site by referencing contact information of the certain site stored in advance at the product (see [0020], [0025]); transmitting the proper information of the product from the product to the certain site (see [0033] and [0036]), the proper information including a model name or a model number of the product stored on the product prior to contacting the certain site (see [0023]); receiving the product service menu (see fig. 4, [0025]) corresponding to the product after the proper information has been transmitted to the certain site (see [0031], [0034], [0038], [0039]); selecting information from the received service menu at the product; receiving at the product, the selected information from the service menu (e.g. product information 404 can include product specs, which will be displayed after the user selects it ([0025], [0040])).

Wright fails to disclose that the “product” is a TV and further lacks the step of transmitting a proper information of the product when a checkup key signal is input by the user.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hayashi discloses storing proper information that is typically found on a label of a television in the storing unit at a time of manufacture (see [0015]), wherein this proper information read out of memory when the user enters service mode (see [0013]) for troubleshooting or maintenance (see [0001]). Hayashi further discloses that user enters such a service mode by a predetermined key operation (see [0016]). Hayashi therefore teaches the step of a product that is a television, storing label information in the storage unit of the

television, and using a check up key signal for product maintenance information, wherein the label information is read out from memory when user inputs the check up key signal.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Wright in a television system such as Hayashi, thereby providing user updated, relevant information in a "service mode" related to user's specific product when a check up key is input.

With regards to claim 11, Wright discloses directing the user to a site in order to correct product specific problems (see [0036]).

With regards to claim 13, Hayashi discloses that the check up key is inputted in order to enter a "service mode" of the television to perform functions other than the normal television operations (see [0010]). Therefore the television processes a broadcast signal after receiving the broadcast signal prior to the check up key signal being input.

With regards to claim 14, Wright discloses that the information corresponding to function information and error check up menu of the TV is received from the service related site server (see [0045]).

With regards to claim 17, Wright provides means for users to communicate with technicians. Examiner further notes that there exist scenarios where fatal errors may occur. Accordingly it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the feature of contacting the technician as taught by Wright in the event of such fatal errors so that the errors can be resolved.

With regards to claim 18, Wright further discloses the step of outputting a list of functions of the TV when the selected information is a function information menu of the TV and displaying the function information requested by the user in the list of function on the screen (see [0031]-[0037])

With regards to claim 19, the modified system comprises a television product, wherein the function information corresponds to the product support manuals (see Wright [0034]). Since television reproduces audio and video signals, it would be obvious to include video or audio related functions in the product specifications for adjusting audio/video related functions.

With regards to claim 21, the modified system discloses receiving error check up menu of the product (i.e. television). See Wright: [0036].

With regards to claim 24, the modified system discloses transmitting information regarding an error to the certain site (see [0036]).

5. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (US PG Pub. 2004/0024657) in view of Hayashi (JP 06217222 A) and further in view of Lee (US Pat. 6,542,897)

With regards to claim 20, the system lacks the step of receiving a general home page information and displaying it on the screen of the TV when the proper information is not transmitted to the certain site. Lee discloses the step of displaying, a general page listing a plurality of models is displayed to the user (see fig. 6, Lee) so that the user can select the model wherein a proper information is not transmitted to the site. It would have been obvious to modify the system of Lee to

take a user to a general webpage related to a group of products, when a proper information cannot be transmitted, thereby allowing a user to select information related to desired model.

6. Claims 2, 15-16, 22-23, 25, 27-30, and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. (US PG Pub. 2004/0024657) in view of Hayashi (JP 06217222 A) and further in view of

With regards to claims 15, and 16, the modified system lacks receiving a list of errors when the selected information is error check up menu and further fails disclose the step of automatically applying the received error information so as to restore the error of the television.

Platt discloses the step of logging all errors including new errors in order to learn history of failures at a machine, analyze the error to provide the needed repairs. See Platt: column 4, lines 8-13, column 10, lines 37-41. Platt additionally discloses the step of restoring a failure by transmitting a script for restoring the problem, thereby automatically restoring an error when possible. See column 4, lines 5-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system in view of Platt's teachings by enabling the service site to transmit a script for automatically resorting an error when possible, thereby improving troubleshooting for the user and further modify by logging errors to obtain a history of failures at the client device, as well as analyze new errors to provide the needed repairs.

With regards to claims 2, 22, 25, Wright discloses sending user a webpage that corrects a user's specific encountered problem (see [0036]), however fails to disclose automatically restoring error based on received error information.

In analogous art, Platt discloses the step of restoring a failure by transmitting a script for restoring the problem, thereby automatically restoring an error when possible. See column 4, lines 5-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Platt's teachings by enabling the service site to transmit a script for automatically resorting an error when possible, thereby providing user with improved troubleshooting.

With regards to claim 23, the system as modified in claim 22 automatically restores error based on the received measures (see Wright: 0036 and Platt: column 4, lines 5-8).

With regards to claim 26, the received information is based on selection of an item in the error check up menu (note Wright figure 3a, steps 306a, 308a, figure 4, and [0031]-[0039]).)

With regards to claim 27, Wright discloses a system comprising a product's storing unit (200) for storing proper information of the product;

Controlling unit (202) for contacting an Internet site and for transmitting stored information and the error information of the product from the product to the Internet site (see [0030], [0036]), the stored information being stored prior to the product contacting the Internet site (see [0020] and [0024]) and the control unit transmitting

error information of the product to the Internet site and receiving error information based on the transmitted error information and received error information correcting the error (see [0036])

Wright fails to disclose that the “product” is a TV and further lacks the step of transmitting a proper information of the product when a checkup key signal is input by the user. While Wright discloses sending user a webpage that corrects a user’s specific encountered problem (see [0036]), Wright fails to disclose automatically restoring error based on received error information.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hayashi discloses storing proper information that is typically found on a label of a television in the storing unit at a time of manufacture (see [0015]), wherein this proper information read out of memory when the user enters service mode (see [0013]) for troubleshooting or maintenance (see [0001]). Hayashi further discloses that user enters such a service mode by a predetermined key operation (see [0016]). Hayashi therefore teaches the step of a product that is a television, storing label information in the storage unit of the television, and using an check up key signal for product maintenance information, wherein the label information is read out from memory when user inputs the check up key signal.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Wright in a television system such as Hayashi, thereby providing user updated, relevant information in a “service mode” related to user’s specific product when a check up key is input.

In further analogous art, Platt discloses the step of restoring a failure by transmitting a script for restoring the problem, thereby automatically restoring an error when possible. See column 4, lines 5-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Platt's teachings by enabling the service site to transmit a script for automatically resorting an error when possible, thereby providing user with improved troubleshooting.

With regards to claim 28, the modified system discloses receiving error check up menu of the product (i.e. television). See Wright: [0036].

With regards to claim 29, the modified system further comprises a display 206.

With regards to claim 30, the modified system further outputs errors and controls displaying error information requested by a user (see Wright [0036]).

With regards to claim 40, the modified system teaches the limitation of storing model name (i.e. product name) of the television prior to contacting the particular website. See Wright, [0023].

With regards to claim 41, the modified system is silent on the step of storing a model number of the product. Note that Wright mentions that label stored in memory may include information that is typically found on a product label. See [0023]. Examiner takes official notice that model numbers are well known in the art to be included as part of product labels. Therefore it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to include the model number as part of the product label in order to identify the product model types.

With respect to claim 42, Wright discloses a system comprising a storing unit (200) for storing proper information of the product and the URL of a certain site (see [0020], [0025]), the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV (see [0023]);

Controlling unit (202) for contacting the certain site based on the URL and for transmitting proper information from the product to the certain site (see [0030], [0036]), and the controlling unit controlling displaying of information corresponding to function information (404) and error check up menu (410, 406) of the product received from the Internet based on the proper information of the product and the contact information (see [0036]-[0037] and [0039]), the storing unit storing proper information of the product prior to the controlling unit contacting the certain site (see [0020], [0025]).

Wright fails to disclose that the “product” is a TV and further lacks the step of transmitting a proper information of the product when a checkup key signal is input by the user. While Wright discloses sending user a webpage that corrects a user’s specific encountered problem (see [0036]), Wright fails to disclose automatically restoring error based on received error information.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hayashi discloses storing proper information that is typically found on a label of a television in the storing unit at a time of manufacture (see [0015]), wherein this proper information read out of memory when

the user enters service mode (see [0013]) for troubleshooting or maintenance (see [0001]). Hayashi further discloses that user enters such a service mode by a predetermined key operation (see [0016]). Hayashi therefore teaches the step of a product that is a television, storing label information in the storage unit of the television, and using an check up key signal for product maintenance information, wherein the label information is read out from memory when user inputs the check up key signal.

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ the teachings of Wright in a television system such as Hayashi, thereby providing user updated, relevant information in a “service mode” related to user’s specific product when a check up key is input. The modified system comprises a television product, wherein the function information corresponds to the product support manuals (see Wright [0034]). Since television reproduces audio and video signals, it would be obvious to include video or audio related functions in the product specifications for adjusting audio/video related functions.

In further analogous art, Platt discloses the step of restoring a failure by transmitting a script for restoring the problem, thereby automatically restoring an error when possible. See column 4, lines 5-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the system in view of Platt’s teachings by enabling the service site to transmit a script for automatically resorting an error when possible, thereby providing user with improved troubleshooting.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to USHA RAMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7380. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623

/Usha Raman/